

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended herein. Support is found, for example, on page 3, 1st and 2nd paragraphs, and the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 in the specification. Hence no new matter is presented.

Accordingly, upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-6 will be all of the claims pending in the application.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Shioya et al (USPN 6,091,382).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shioya et al.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Senoo et al (USPN 6,517,957) in view of Kawai (USPN 4,590,128).

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the arguments in the Amendment filed on June 17, 2004, were not considered to be persuasive.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that the presently claimed invention is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art.

The present invention is directed to an organic electroluminescent display comprising, *inter alia*, a half mirror disposed on the outer surface of the transparent substrate and at a distance from the organic EL layer to display an image that produces a sense of depth, wherein the transparent electrode is in direct contact with the organic EL layer as set forth in amended claim 1.

Shioya et al does not disclose all elements of the claimed invention as required for anticipation. Specifically, Shioya et al does not disclose an organic EL layer disposed on the transparent electrode as recited in independent claim 1. As shown in Figure 29 of Shioya et al, a luminescent layer 16 is disposed on the photoconductive layer 14, and not on the transparent electrode.

Further, Shioya et al does not suggest a transparent electrode that is in direct contact with an organic EL layer as in amended claim 1. Thus, Shioya et al does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is distinguished over Shioya et al for at least the same reasons.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Shioya et al.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Senoo et al in view of Kawai, Applicants submit that claim 1 is amended to recite that the half mirror is disposed on the outer surface of the transparent substrate and at a distance from the organic EL layer to display an image that produces a sense of depth, wherein the transparent electrode is in direct contact with the organic EL layer. Therefore the claimed invention is both structurally and functionally distinguished over the prior art. Further, it has already been pointed out that even if combined, the combination of Senoo et al and Kawai et al would not provide a sense of depth displayed with the structure of the present invention. See pages 3-4 of the Response filed on June 17, 2004, which is incorporated herein by reference. Thus, the presently claimed


invention is not rendered obvious over the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Senoo et al and Kawai et al.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Jennifer M. Hayes
Registration No. 40,641

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 12, 2004